

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 575

November 15, 1995, 2:52 p.m.
Page S-17067 Temp. Record

FOREIGN OPERATIONS CONFERENCE/U.S. Foreign Aid for Abortions

SUBJECT: Amendments in disagreement to the conference report to accompany the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 1868. Hatfield motion to table the Senate amendment in disagreement No. 115.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 54-44

SYNOPSIS: The conference report to accompany H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide a total of \$12.1 billion in new budget authority for foreign aid programs in fiscal year (FY) 1996. This amount is \$1.55 billion below the FY 1995 appropriated amount.

The Senate amendment in disagreement No. 115 would provide that there would be no restrictions on funding for foreign organizations that provide abortion services as a method of family planning, nor would there be restrictions on funding for the United Nations Population Fund while it was operating in China (the House provisions on these subjects were removed by conferees, leaving the only language in the conference report on them on this amendment in disagreement).

During debate, Senator Hatfield moved to table the Senate amendment. The motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table favored striking abortion restrictions from the conference report; those opposing the motion to table opposed striking those restrictions.

NOTE: Pending to the Senate amendment was a House amendment to a Senate amendment to a House amendment to the amendment in disagreement (see vote No. 561). The latest House amendment on prohibiting funding from going to organizations that provide abortion as a method of family planning (the "Mexico City" policy) was modified to make it apply only to foreign private organizations. Also, the House modified the section regarding the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) by redefining the term "motivate" so as not to prohibit family planning counseling.

Some Senators mistakenly contended that tabling the underlying amendment in disagreement effectively ended the disagreement with the House, thus clearing the bill for the President. However, a measure may not be cleared for the President's signature until both Houses agree to the same language. Under the House's rules, and constitutionally, the House may not enroll the bill until it is

(See other side)

YEAS (54)			NAYS (44)			NOT VOTING (1)		
Republicans (12 or 23%)	Democrats (42 or 91%)		Republicans (40 or 77%)	Democrats (4 or 9%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)	
Brown	Akaka	Kennedy	Abraham	Hatch	Breaux	Lugar- ²		
Campbell	Baucus	Kerrey	Ashcroft	Helms	Ford			
Chafee	Biden	Kerry	Bennett	Hutchison	Heflin			
Cohen	Bingaman	Kohl	Bond	Inhofe	Johnston			
Hatfield	Boxer	Lautenberg	Burns	Kempthorne				
Jeffords	Bradley	Leahy	Coats	Kyl				
Kassebaum	Bryan	Levin	Cochran	Lott				
Roth	Bumpers	Lieberman	Coverdell	Mack				
Simpson	Byrd	Mikulski	Craig	McCain				
Snowe	Conrad	Moseley-Braun	D'Amato	McConnell				
Specter	Daschle	Moynihan	DeWine	Murkowski				
Stevens	Dodd	Murray	Dole	Nickles				
	Dorgan	Nunn	Domenici	Pressler				
	Exon	Pell	Faircloth	Santorum				
	Feingold	Pryor	Frist	Shelby				
	Feinstein	Reid	Gorton	Smith				
	Glenn	Robb	Gramm	Thomas				
	Graham	Rockefeller	Grams	Thompson				
	Harkin	Sarbanes	Grassley	Thurmond				
	Hollings	Simon	Gregg	Warner				
	Inouye	Wellstone						
EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE								
1—Official Business								
2—Necessarily Absent								
3—Illness								
4—Other								
SYMBOLS:								
AY—Announced Yea								
AN—Announced Nay								
PY—Paired Yea								
PN—Paired Nay								

in agreement with the Senate. At this point, the House may recede from its amendment, insist on its amendment, or insist and request a further conference.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

Some of us who support this motion to table are pro-choice; some of us are pro-life. Together we support this motion because we do not want passage of this conference report to be further delayed. We will be happy to consider restrictions on abortion funding on separate, authorizing legislation, but we will not support them on this appropriations bill.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The House has been working to find compromise language. The Senate should not abandon the effort by taking the all-or-nothing stance of tabling the underlying amendment in disagreement.